CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TM 5257RPL³, Log No. 01-09-019; Sunset Vista/Theaker Major Subdivision

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, CA 92123-1666

- 3. a. Contact Megan Hamilton, Project Manager
 - b. Phone number: (858) 694-3694
 - c. E-mail: megan.hamilton@sdcounty.ca.gov.
- 4. Project location:

The project is located at 1454 Ashley Road on the north side of Hanson Lane between Ashley Road and Keyes Road in the Ramona Community Planning Area, an unincorporated area of County of San Diego (APN is 284-032-17).

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1152, Grid H/7

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Thomas and Annette Theaker, 1303 Olive Street, Ramona, CA 92065

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan: Ramona

Land Use Designation: 1 - Residential

Density: 1 du/1, 2, 4 acres (Slope dependent)

7. Zoning

Use Regulation: A70, Limited Agriculture

Minimum Lot Size: 1du/1 acre

Special Area Regulation: --

8. Description of project:

The project proposes a major subdivision of 9.3 gross acres into 8 residential lots ranging in size from 1.06 to 1.40 acres. Construction activities as a result of the subdivision will include: eight housing pads with associated driveways, and fire clearing. Grading is proposed to be a balance cut and fill operation of 4,800 cubic yards. An existing house is to be removed on proposed Parcel 3. The project will take access off Hanson Lane, an existing publicly maintained road. The project will be served by the Ramona Fire Department CDF, Ramona Municipal Water District.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

To the north of the project site are existing single-family dwellings on lots ranging in size from 0.60 to 1.27 acres. To the south are existing single-family dwellings on lots ranging in size from 0.50 to 1.25 acres and the Neighborhood Baptist Church. To the east are existing single-family dwellings on 1.0-acre lots and to the west are existing single-family dwellings on 0.60-acre lots and two vacant parcels (4.5-acres each). The majority of the project site supports open grassland, while the remainder of the site is developed.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
Water District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water District
Sewer District Approval	Ramona Municipal Water District
Fire District Approval	Ramona Fire District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

Megan Hamilton

Printed Name

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

- 4 -

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4. "Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- 5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

CEQA Initial Study, TM 5257RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 5 -	August 10, 2006	
I. AESTHETICS Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect of	on a scenic vista?		
Potentially Significant ImpactPotentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	☐ Less t ☑ No Im	han Significant Impact	
Discussion/Explanation:			
No Impact: Scenic vistas are singular vantage points that offer unobstructed views of valued viewsheds, including areas designated as official scenic vistas along major highways or County designated visual resources. The proposed project is not located near or visible from a scenic vista and will not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. The project site is located at 1454 Ashley Road, Ramona. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.			
b) Substantially damage scenic resou outcroppings, and historic buildings			
Potentially Significant ImpactPotentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	☐ Less t	han Significant Impact	

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated. A scenic highway is officially designated as a State scenic highway when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program, applies to the California Department of Transportation for scenic highway approval, and receives notification from CalTrans that the highway has been designated as an official Scenic Highway. The proposed project is not located near or visible within the same composite viewshed as a State scenic highway and will not change the visual composition of an existing scenic resource within a State scenic highway. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The project site is surrounded by urban development. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 6 -	August 10, 2006
,	Substantially degrade the existing value of the surroundings?	visual char	acter or quality of the site and its
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless		Less than Significant Impact
Ц	Mitigation Incorporated	Ш	No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
visible the pat discuss viewer' and ex	pectation of the viewers. The exist d surrounding can be characterized	al characted texture. Valiversity and nent and valing visual of	er is based on the organization of lisual character is commonly d continuity. Visual quality is the lines based on exposure, sensitivity character and quality of the project
visual e	oposed project is a major subdivision environment's visual character and ntial development on similar size lot	quality for	
the ent viewsh compre located cumula alterati advers	oject will not result in cumulative im ire existing viewshed and a list of ped were evaluated. Refer to XVII. I when sive list of the projects consided within the viewshed surrounding that ive impact for the following reason on since the site is relatively flat. The project or cumulative level effect anding area.	hast, preser Mandatory ered. Thos he project a hs: it doesn Therefore, t	nt and future projects within that Findings of Significance for a e projects listed in Section XVII are and will not contribute to a 't propose significant landform he project will not result in any
•	Create a new source of substantial day or nighttime views in the area?	-	are, which would adversely affect
	Potentially Significant Impact	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Less than Significant Impact
	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115),

including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project proposes a major residential subdivision, which may include outdoor lighting. Any future outdoor lighting pursuant to this project shall be required to meet the requirements of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Section 6322-6326) and the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115).

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level

<u>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

,	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmla Importance Farmland), as shown on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Prog to non-agricultural use?	maps	prepared pursuant to the
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project does not contain Farmland of Local

Mitigation Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP, therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

- 9 -

b)	Violate any air quality standard or coprojected air quality violation?	ntribute s	substantially to an existing or
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) has established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. For CEQA purposes, these screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the CEQA Air Quality Handbook for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which has stricter standards for emissions of ROCs/VOCs than San Diego's, is appropriate. However, the eastern portions of the county have atmospheric conditions that are characteristic of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB). SEDAB is not classified as an extreme non-attainment area for ozone and therefore has a less restrictive screening-level. Projects located in the eastern portions of the County can use the SEDAB screening-level threshold for VOCs.

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a major subdivision. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 84 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air

- 10 -

Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

,	which the project region is non-attainment ambient air quality standard (including a quantitative thresholds for ozone precu	ent und releasi	der an applicable federal or state ng emissions which exceed
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM_{10} , NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and VOCs as the result of increase of traffic from operations at the facility. However, grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM_{10} and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 84 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM_{10} .

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants.

- 11 -

Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM10, or any O₃ precursors.

a) i	Expose sensitive receptors to substantia	i pollu	itant concentrations?
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
Grade)	lity regulators typically define sensitive re, hospitals, resident care facilities, or day ndividuals with health conditions that would be used.	/-care	centers, or other facilities that may
No Impact: No sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project. Furthermore, no point-source emissions of air pollutants (other than vehicle emissions) are associated with the project. As such, the project will not expose sensitive populations to excessive levels of air pollutants.			
e) (Create objectionable odors affecting a su	ubstar	ntial number of people?
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Evalanation:		

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less that 1 $\mu g/m^3$). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor. A list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these

projects create objectionable odors. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

, 	Have a substantial adverse effect, eith on any species identified as a candida ocal or regional plans, policies, or reg Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wild	ate, sens Julations	sitive, or special status species in s, or by the California Department of
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The following discussion is based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report dated November 1, 2004 prepared by Vince Scheidt. The 9.3 acre site supports 7.9 acres of non-native grasslands and 1.4 acres of urban development associated with the existing single-family residence onsite. No sensitive species were observed onsite, although a red-shouldered hawk and turkey vulture were observed soaring overhead. A Phase I focused survey for Stephen's Kangaroo Rat was negative for this species. Additionally, no less than six reconnaissance surveys were completed February through April 2003 to determine whether the site supported vernal pools, a County RPO wetland. Although some remnant vernal pool indicator species were observed, no evidence of sensitive vernal pool species were observed, and it was determined that the site does not support vernal pool habitat. The project will mitigate impacts to Ramona non-native grasslands at a ratio of 1:1 in the Ramona area. Thus, it has been determined that although the site supports naturalized biological habitat of regional significance, the removal of this habitat will not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

There are other projects in the Ramona area, in particular TM5311 located immediately to the west of the project site. This project is requiring a mitigation of ratio of 0.5:1 for impacts to 5.1 acres of non-native grasslands. The mitigation ratio for habitat loss applied to the Sunset Vista/Theaker project is meant to help compensate for the direct as well as cumulative loss of habitat in the Ramona area. The fact the mitigation ratio is higher than within the regional preserve plan area of the MSCP (where a cumulative analysis has been completed and mitigation ratios for non-native grasslands is only 0.5:1 unless occupied by burrowing owl) helps to prevent excessive and indiscriminate loss of habitat that qualifies as RPO sensitive before a regional NCCP/Subarea Plan can be adopted.

r	Have a substantial adverse effect on an natural community identified in local or he California Department of Fish and G	region	al plans, policies, regulations or by
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The following discussion is based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report dated November 1, 2004 prepared by Vince Scheidt. The 9.3-acre site supports 7.9 acres of non-native grasslands and 1.4 acres of urban development associated with the existing single-family residence on-site. Six reconnaissance surveys were completed February through April 2003 to determine whether the site supported vernal pools, a County RPO wetland. Although some remnant vernal pool indicator species were observed, no evidence of sensitive vernal pool species that qualify as riparian habitat were observed, and it was determined that the site does not support vernal pool (riparian) habitat. Thus, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat. The 7.9 acres of non-native grasslands that will be impacted by the project is considered a sensitive natural community. The project will mitigate impacts to Ramona non-native grasslands at a ratio of 1:1 in the Ramona area. Thus, it has been determined that through mitigation measures that the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service.

There are other projects in the Ramona area, in particular TM 5311 located immediately to the west of the project site. This project is only requiring a mitigation of ration of 0.5:1 for impacts to 5.1 acres of non-native grasslands. The mitigation ratio for habitat loss applied to the Sunset Vista/Theaker project is meant to help compensate for the direct as well as cumulative loss of habitat in the Ramona area. The fact the mitigation ratio is higher than within the regional preserve plan area of the MSCP (where a cumulative analysis has been completed and mitigation ratios for non-native grasslands is only 0.5:1 unless occupies by burrowing owl) helps to prevent excessive and indiscriminate loss of habitat that qualifies as RPO sensitive before a regional NCCP/Subarea Plan can be adopted.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

	nitial Study, 7RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 14 -	August 10, 2006
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
prepare not con but not potentia diversio to wetla	ally be impacted through direct rem on or obstruction by the proposed o	termined thection 404 (am, lake, rinoval, fillingdevelopmer	at the proposed project site does of the Clean Water Act, including, ver or water of the U.S., that could
Ć	nterfere substantially with the mover wildlife species or with establish corridors, or impede the use of nat	ed native re	5 ,
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
Less than Significant Impact: The following discussion is based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, and a Biological Resources Report dated November 1, 2004 prepared by Vince Scheidt. Surrounding development limits the site for movement of species. The site is also unlikely to be used as a nursery site as a result of surrounding development and disturbances associated with the existing residence on-site. The grassland on-site does provide foraging habitat for raptors and the loss of this foraging habitat will be mitigated at a ratio of 1:1 in the Ramona area to help prevent cumulative loss of Ramona grasslands.			
´ (Conflict with the provisions of any a Communities Conservation Plan, o conservation plan or any other locatesources?	ther approv	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 10, 2006 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP) Special Area Management Plans (SAMP) or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

Permit	(HLP).		(i.i. 5), Habiai 2000
a)	LTURAL RESOURCES Would the pro Cause a substantial adverse change in t as defined in 15064.5?	•	nificance of a historical resource
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
-	pact: The County of San Diego staff arc of the property, analyzed records, and c ces.		•
,	Cause a substantial adverse change in t resource pursuant to 15064.5?	he sig	nificance of an archaeological
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
photog	pact: The staff archaeologist, Donna Be graphs, maps, and the County of San Die etermined the property does not contain s	go ard	chaeology/biology resource files
,	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique pa geologic feature?	leonto	logical resource or site or unique
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan (see Appendix G for a listing of unique geological features) or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d)	Disturb any human remains, including the cemeteries?	iose ir	nterred outside of formal
	Potentially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	$\overline{\checkmark}$	No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
of San will no cemet	pact: Based on an analysis of records an Diego staff archaeologist Donna Beddon to disturb any human remains because the ery or any archaeological resources that EOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project Expose people or structures to potential wink of large injury, or double involving the project of large injury.	w it ha e proje might ect:	as been determined that the project ect site does not include a formal contain interred human remains.
	risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i. Rupture of a known earthquake fa Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Z for the area or based on other sul Refer to Division of Mines and Ge	oning bstant	Map issued by the State Geologist ial evidence of a known fault?
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Diague	oion/Evolonation		

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the

CEQA I TM 525	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 17 -	August 10, 2006		
•	re of people or structures to adve f this project.	rse effects fi	rom a known hazard zone as a		
ii	i. Strong seismic ground sha	king?			
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact		
Discuss	sion/Explanation:				
classified However active-fa Fault No the Seis within the propose before the from the seismic	No Impact : The Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the California Building Code (CBC) classifies all San Diego County with the highest seismic zone criteria, Zone 4. However, the project is not located within 5 kilometers of the centerline of a known active-fault zone as defined within the Uniform Building Code's Maps of Known Active Fault Near-Source Zones in California. In addition, the project will have to conform to the Seismic Requirements Chapter 16 Section 162- <i>Earthquake Design</i> as outlined within the California Building Code. Section 162 requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved by a County Structural Engineer before the issuance of a building or grading permit. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking as a result of this project.				
	ii. Seismic-related ground fail				
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact		
Discuss	sion/Explanation:				
Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is identified as Quaternary Alluvium . Due to the topography of the site (flat) it has been determined that the project on-site conditions do not have susceptibility to settlement and liquefaction. Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.					
į	v. Landslides?				
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact		

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the I	oss of	topsoil?
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Placentia sandy loam and Fallbrook sandy loam that has a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan dated June 20, 2005, prepared by P & D Consultants. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site especially during the construction phase: use of mulches; geotextiles, plastic covers, stabilized construction entrance/exit, runoff control measures such as graded surfaces to redirect sheet flow; silt fence and sand/gravel bag/berms.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and

Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

c)	Will the project produce unstable geologimpacts resulting from landslides, latera collapse?	•	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discu	ssion/Explanation:		
No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. Based on aerial photos and site photos, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.			
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined Code (1994), creating substantial risks to		•
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils onsite are Placentia sandy loam and Fallbrook sandy loam. These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of high and moderate respectively. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

CEQA TM 52	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 20 -	August 10, 2006	
,	Have soils incapable of adequately alternative wastewater disposal sys disposal of wastewater?		•	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discus	sion/Explanation:			
wastew the Rai for the disposa VII. HA a)	No Impact: The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated April 27, 2005 has been received from the Ramona Municipal Water District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the projects wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed. VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes?			
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discus	sion/Explanation:			
enviror disposa	pact: The project will not create a soment because it does not propose all of Hazardous Substances, nor arely in use in the immediate vicinity.	the storage	e, use, transport, emission, or	
,	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
Discuss	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated sion/Explanation:		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
יסטטטוע	οιστη Ελριατιατίστι.			

No Impact: The project will not contain, handle, or store any potential sources of chemicals or compounds that would present a significant risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

	nitial Study, - 7RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	21 -	August 10, 2006	
,	Emit hazardous emissions or handle substances, or waste within one-qu		•	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discuss	ion/Explanation:			
propose	act: The project is not located with ed school. Therefore, the project wed school.	•		
Ć	Be located on a site which is include compiled pursuant to Government Controls are a significant hazard to the page 1	Code Section	on 65962.5 and, as a result, would	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discuss	ion/Explanation:			
No Impact: The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.				
n th	e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discussion/Explanation:				

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports; or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

CEQA Initial Study, TM 5257RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 22 -	August 10, 2006	
, , ,	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?		
Potentially Significant ImpactPotentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discussion/Explanation:			
No Impact: The proposed project is not result, the project will not constitute a saf project area.		•	
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
Potentially Significant ImpactPotentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discussion/Explanation:			

response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a framework document that provides direction to local jurisdictions to develop specific operational area of San Diego County. It provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established.

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

h)	Expose people or structures to a signification wildland fires, including where wildland where residences are intermixed with version of the structures to a significant wildland wildland wildland.	s are a	djacent to urbanized areas or
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated May 18, 2006 have been received from the Ramona Fire Protection District. The conditions from the Ramona Fire Protection District include: installation of a fire hydrant, posting of no parking signs or red curbs. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the Ramona Fire Protection District's conditions, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and San Dieguito River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, nutrients, sediment, lowered dissolve oxygen, and trace metals.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: construction and potential landscaping associated with single family residences. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: construction source control BMPs: geotextiles, plastic covers, stabilized construction entrance/exit, runoff control measures such as graded surfaces to redirect sheet flow; silt fence and sand/gravel bag/berms. Site design BMPs: minimize impervious surface (about 16% of site); direct runoff to grass lined swales and landscaped areas; use of rip rap at all storm drain outlets.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

,	Could the proposed project cause or co surface or groundwater receiving water beneficial uses?	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Ramona hydrologic subarea, within the San Dieguito hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: sediment, nutrients, pesticides, oxygen, bacteria, hydrocarbons. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: construction source control BMPs: geotextiles, plastic covers, stabilized construction entrance/exit, runoff control measures such as graded surfaces to redirect sheet flow; silt fence and sand/gravel bag/berms. Site design BMPs: minimize impervious surface (about 16% of site); direct runoff to grass lined swales and landscaped areas; use of infiltration systems for all residential roof drainage; use of rip rap at all storm drain outlets. In particular, infiltration basins have a high removal efficiency for sediments and bacteria.

In addition, the proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

•	groundwater recharge such that there we a lowering of the local groundwater table existing nearby wells would drop to a levuses or planned uses for which permits	ould be leve	be a net deficit in aquifer volume or I (e.g., the production rate of pre- lich would not support existing land
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
District project comme interfer following ground imperv mile).	pact: The project will obtain its water sure that obtains water from surface reservors will not use any groundwater for any purercial demands. In addition, the project of the substantially with groundwater recharging: the project does not involve regional dwater basin; or diversion or channelization in the project as concrete lining or currently the project and operations can subsequently. These activities and operations can subsequently the project water basin; or diversion or channelizations.	irs or rpose does r ge inc diver on of ulverts	other imported water source. The including irrigation, domestic or not involve operations that would luding, but not limited to the sion of water to another a stream course or waterway with s, for substantial distances (e.g. ½ ally affect rates of groundwater
,	Substantially alter the existing drainage through the alteration of the course of a result in substantial erosion or siltation of the course of a result in substantial erosion or siltation of the course of the co	streaı	m or river, in a manner which would
	Potentially Significant Impact	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Less than Significant Impact
	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a 8 lot major subdivision. DPW staff has reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan dated June 20, 2005, Preliminary Grading Plan submitted March 27, 2006, and Preliminary Drainage Study dated January 3, 2006 prepared by P & D Consultants. Previous comments have been addressed. The document is substantially complete and complies with the County of San Diego Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and WPO requirements for a Stormwater Management Plan. As outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: construction source control BMPs: geotextiles, plastic covers, stabilized construction entrance/exit, runoff control measures such as graded

- 28 -

surfaces to redirect sheet flow; silt fence and sand/gravel bag/berms. Site design BMPs: minimize impervious surface (about 16% of site); direct runoff to grass lined swales and landscaped areas; use of infiltration systems for all residential roof drainage; use of rip rap at all storm drain outlets. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any on-site and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Prior to recordation of final map, the developer shall record an easement with covenant in accordance with County guideline Category 2 mechanism to assure maintenance. Maintenance requirements and costs for treatment BMPs shall be based on County of San Diego Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) appendix H. Ref: Ordinance 9424 Section 67.819 Maintenance of BMPs. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

,	substantially after the existing drainage through the alteration of the course of a the rate or amount of surface runoff in a con- or off-site?	strea	m or river, or substantially increase
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the preliminary drainage study prepared by P & D Consultants dated January 3, 2006, the proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns & not significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- a. Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- b. The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 1 feet or more in height.

c. The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onor off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?					
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact		
Discus	sion/Explanation:				
runoff v system	Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. (See preliminary drainage study prepared by P & D Consultants dated January 3, 2006.)				
h)	h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact		
	· · ·				

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: sediment, nutrients, pesticides, oxygen, bacteria, hydrocarbons. However, the following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable: construction source control BMPs: geotextiles, plastic covers, stabilized construction entrance/exit, runoff control measures such as graded surfaces to redirect sheet flow; silt fence and sand/gravel bag/berms. Site design BMPs: minimize impervious surface (about 16% of site); direct runoff to grass lined swales and landscaped areas; use of infiltration systems for all residential roof drainage; use of rip-rap at all storm drain outlets. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 30 -	August 10, 2006
i)		ance Rate Ma	area as mapped on a federal Flood ap or other flood hazard delineation
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
were id areas. units; t	Improvements will be made to in	ere are no pl sure there ar See prelimina	lans to place housing within these
j)	Place within a 100-year flood haz redirect flood flows?	ard area stru	uctures which would impede or
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
project Improv impact	Than Significant Impact: A 100- t site, but there are no plans to pla rements will be made so as to not will occur. (See preliminary drain ted August 30, 2005.)	ace structures impede or re	s within these areas. edirect flood flows; therefore, no
k)	Expose people or structures to a flooding, including flooding as a re		sk of loss, injury or death involving ailure of a levee or dam?
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

CEQA Initial Study, - TM 5257RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019		- 31 -	August 10, 2000	
l) I	nundation by seiche, tsunami, or n	nudflow?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discuss	sion/Explanation:			
i. \$	SEICHE			
-	pact: The project site is not located re, could not be inundated by a sei	_	shoreline of a lake or reservoir;	
ii	TSUNAMI			
-	pact: The project site is located more facts a tsunami, would not be inundate		mile from the coast; therefore, in the	
iii. ľ	MUDFLOW			
suscept of the p existing addition soils, the	g conditions that could become uns n, though the project does propose ne project is not located downstreal	as determi be located table in the land distur m from unp t is not anti	ned that the geologic environment d within an area of potential or pre- e event of seismic activity. In bance that will expose unprotected	
	ND USE AND PLANNING Would Physically divide an established co		ct:	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact	
Discuss	sion/Explanation:			

No Impact: The project does not propose the introducing new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific

CEQA TM 52	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 32 -	August 10, 2006
	plan, local coastal program, or zor avoiding or mitigating an environm	•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	ssion/Explanation:		
Discussion/Explanation: Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.1 Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation (1) Residential. Policy 1.1 states that development should approach the maximum density permitted under the community or subregional plan. The (1) Residential Land Use Designation of the Ramona Community Plan is designed to provide low-density residential and minor agricultural uses. Minimum one-acre parcel sizes are permitted under this designation when the average slope of a proposed parcel does not exceed 15 percent. The entire subject property has slopes of less than 15 percent and proposes an overall density of 0.75 dwelling units per gross acre. A higher density is not feasible for this project due to the location of the 100-year flood plain. As such, the project meets the requirements of the General Plan. The Community Character and Residential Land Use Goals of the Ramona Community Plan encourage a site design that minimizes grading and maintains floodplains in as natural state as possible. The project meets the goals of the Ramona Community Plan as the entire subject property has slopes of less than 15 percent and the applicant proposes minimal grading. Furthermore, the project does not propose to significantly change the 100-year flood plain that is located on the southeast corner of the site. The current zone is A70 Limited Agriculture Use Regulation, which requires a net			
propos	um lot size of 1.0-acre. With lot siz sed project is consistent with the Zonthout the need for zoning variance	oning Ordina	ance requirements for minimum lot
X. Mi la)	NERAL RESOURCES Would the Result in the loss of availability of value to the region and the resider	a known mii	

Discussion/Explanation:

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

Mitigation Incorporated

Potentially Significant Unless

Less Than Significant Impact: Although the project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of

✓ Less than Significant Impact

No Impact

Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3, staff geologist has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that the site is not located within an alluvial river valley or underlain by coastal marine/nonmarine granular deposits. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state will occur as a result of this project. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

,	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
Use Zo	pact: The project site is zoned A70, whi one (S82) nor does it have an Impact Se ractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County L	nsitive	e Land Use Designation (24) with
a)	PISE Would the project result in: Exposure of persons to or generation of established in the local general plan or r of other agencies?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The project is a major subdivision and will be occupied by residents. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated December 27, 2005, the surrounding area supports single family residences and is occupied by residents. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by by Eilar Associates and dated December 27, 2005 project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Ramona Community Plan

The County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan, has a standard of CNEL 55 dB(A) for all projected noise contours near main circulation roadways, airports and other noise sources and requires mitigation if this level is exceeded. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated December 27, 2005 project implementation may expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, and noise in excess of the CNEL 55 dB(A). Mitigation measures in the form of sound attenuation barriers are required along the western, southern and eastern property boundaries. Outdoor use areas on all lots will be below 60 CNEL from traffic noise and significant areas on all lots will be below 55 CNEL in compliance with the Ramona Community Plan. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Ramona Community Plan.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated December 27, 2005 non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site and surrounding area is zoned A70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 45dB. The Noise Analysis state's the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates and dated December 27, 2005, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75 dB between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b and Ramona Community Plan) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise

level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of groundborne noise levels?	exces	ssive groundborne vibration or
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discu	ssion/Explanation:		
vibrati faciliti noise not ha levels Asses by any	Than Significant Impact: The project prison is essential for interior operation and/ores are setback 200 feet from any public recontours of 65 dB or more. A setback of eave any chance of being impacted by grown (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transment 1995). In addition, the setback ency past, present or future projects that may ion or groundborne noise.	or slee oad or 200 fe undbor ansit N	eping conditions. However, the transit Right-of-Way with projected eet ensures that the operations do rne vibration or groundborne noise Noise and Vibration Impact that the project will not be affected
mass gener	the project does not propose any major, r transit, highways or major roadways or in ate excessive groundborne vibration or g ion sensitive uses in the surrounding area	itensiv roundl	e extractive industry that could
	fore, the project will not expose persons to ion or groundborne noise levels on a proje	_	<u> </u>
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambabove levels existing without the project		noise levels in the project vicinity
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: increased traffic trips. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose

existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Eilar Associates dated December 27, 2005. The project will increase the ambient noise level by 1.6 dB CNEL. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

d)	A substantial temporary or periodic incr vicinity above levels existing without the	• •
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

	nitial Study, 7RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 37 -	August 10, 2006
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
of a publimplement of excess review of Analysis	olic airport or public use airport for	the Ramor people res CNEL 60 c maps (CNE ted Decemb	siding or working in the project area dB(A). This is based on staff's EL 60 dB(A) contours) a Noise per 27, 2005. The location of the
expand CNEL 6 for a co expose on a pro	mprehensive list of the projects copeople residing or working in the poject or cumulative level.	icinity that refer to XVII. In sidered. Project area	may extend the boundaries of the Mandatory Findings of Significance Therefore, the project will not a to excessive airport-related noise
•	For a project within the vicinity of a people residing or working in the p	•	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
airstrip;	act: The proposed project is not I therefore, the project will not expendence airport-related noise lever the project will not expense.	se people	•
a) I	PULATION AND HOUSING Wonduce substantial population grow proposing new homes and busines extension of roads or other infrastr	th in an are ses) or ind	ea, either directly (for example, by
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

August 10, 2006

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

,	Displace substantial numbers of existing of replacement housing elsewhere?) hous	ing, necessitating the construction
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
residen would r	han Significant Impact: The property ace, which is to be removed and then report displace any amount of existing house dwellings will exist when the lots are deviced.	olaced sing.	d. This residential development Potentially a total of eight single-
•	Displace substantial numbers of people, replacement housing elsewhere?	nece	ssitating the construction of
	Potentially Significant Impact	\checkmark	Less than Significant Impact
	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has one single-family residence, which is to be removed and then replaced. This residential development would not displace any amount of existing housing. Potentially a total of eight singlefamily dwellings will exist when the lots are developed. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios,

	•	nse times or other performance se mance objectives for any of the pu		•
	i. ii. iii. iv. v.	Fire protection? Police protection? Schools? Parks? Other public facilities?		
	Pote	entially Significant Impact		Less than Significant Impact
		entially Significant Unless gation Incorporated	\checkmark	No Impact
Discu	ssion/E	Explanation:		
propo Service availa Districe physical facilities ratios service environ	esed processed processed able to totally altries, sheep processed	Based on the service availability for spicet will not result in the need for spicet will not result in the need for spicet will not result in the provided with the project from the following agent a	significe which cies/des not ing but the received to the recei	cantly altered services or facilities. indicate existing services are istricts: Ramona Municipal Water nvolve the construction of new or at not limited to fire protection of maintain acceptable service ratios or objectives for any public erse physical effect on the
XIV. a)	Would or oth	EATION If the project increase the use of exercise the use of exe	_	•
	Pote	entially Significant Impact	$\overline{\checkmark}$	Less than Significant Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Unless

Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers

No Impact

may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fee. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

Í	Does the project include recreational face expansion of recreational facilities, which on the environment?	•
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

CEQA I TM 525	Initial Study, 37RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 41 -		August 10, 2006
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Z I	Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:			
Federhadeterming this AD capacity Therefore	han Significant: The proposed part & Associates dated March 24, ned that the proposed project will T will not result in a substantial incorporation on roads, or congestion at lore, the project will not have a sign seconsidered substantial in relation ystem. Also refer to the answer for	2005) we result in crease in intersect ifficant dans to exist	as read the street the	reviewed by DPW staff, who additional ADT. The addition of enumber of vehicle trips, volume of in relation to existing conditions. It project impact on traffic volume, traffic load and capacity of the
k	Exceed, either individually or cumuestablished by the County congestoy the County of San Diego Transtoads or highways?	tion man	age	ement agency and/or as identified
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated			Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:			

Discussion/Explanation:

Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project will result in 84 additional ADT. The project's Traffic Impact Analysis (prepared by Federhart & Associates dated March 24, 2005) was reviewed by DPW staff and was determined not to exceed a level of service (LOS) standard at the direct project level. Therefore, the project will not have a significant direct project-level impact on the LOS standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. Cumulative traffic impacts may not be less than significant.

However, the County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. This program is based on a summary of projections method contained in an adopted planning document, as referenced in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(1)(B), which evaluates regional or area wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates 84 additional ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the unincorporated county that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

•		•
Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
on/Explanation:		
Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
֡֡֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜֜	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless It adjacent to any public or private airporage in air traffic patterns. In botantially increase hazards due to a congerous intersections) or incompatible Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated on/Explanation: ct: The proposed project is located outside adjacent to any public or private airports; the ge in air traffic patterns. bstantially increase hazards due to a design negrous intersections) or incompatible uses Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Hanson Lane, or any other public road. A safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of

the Department of Public Works. Any and all road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site shall be to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) f	Result in inadequate emergency access	?	
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
emerge and ass emerge	than Significant Impact: The proposed ency access. The Ramona Fire Departn sociated emergency access roadways a ency fire access proposed. Additionally, ed to County standards. h	nent h	as reviewed the proposed project s determined that there is adequate
f) F	Result in inadequate parking capacity?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discuss	sion/Explanation:		
requires	han Significant Impact: The Zoning Os two on-site parking spaces for each dont area to provide at least two on-site pance.	velling	unit. The proposed lots have
• /	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or partransportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle	_	•
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

August 10, 2006

Less Than Significant: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

a) l	TILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS \ Exceed wastewater treatment requiremed Quality Control Board?		• •
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
commu Control Ramon Therefo commu	than Significant Impact: The project property inity sewer system that is permitted to open Board (RWQCB). A project facility available Municipal Water District that indicates been because the project will be dischargually sewer system, the project is consistents of the RWQCB, including the Regular than the project is consistent to the RWQCB, including the Regular transfer in the RWQCB.	perate ilability the d ing watent w	e by the Regional Water Quality y form has been received from istrict will serve the project. astewater to a RWQCB permitted ith the wastewater treatment
ŕ	Require or result in the construction of n facilities or expansion of existing facilities significant environmental effects?		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Based on the service availability forms received, the project will not require construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Ramona Municipal Water District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

	Initial Study, 57RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 45 -	August 10, 2006
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
water of Refer to Howey facilities	Than Significant Impact: The prodrainage facilities. The new facilities to the Storm water Management Parer, as outlined in this Environment will not result in adverse physication VIII for more information.	es include g lan dated Ju tal Analysis	rass lined bio-filtration swales. ne 20, 2005 for more information.
d)	Have sufficient water supplies ava entitlements and resources, or are		
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		
Munici District availab	Than Significant Impact: The propagate Pal Water District. A Service Avail thas been provided, indicating addule to serve the requested water report water supplies available to servent.	ability Letter equate water sources. Th	r from the Ramona Municipal Water r resources and entitlements are nerefore, the project will have
e)	Result in a determination by the w may serve the project that it has a projected demand in addition to the	dequate cap	pacity to serve the project's
	Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discus	sion/Explanation:		

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires wastewater service from the Ramona Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Ramona Municipal Water District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

CEQA Initial Study, TM 5257RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 46 -	August 10, 2006
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficie project's solid waste disposal need		d capacity to accommodate the
Potentially Significant ImpactPotentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
Less Than Significant Impact: Implement waste. All solid waste facilities, including operate. In San Diego County, the Count Enforcement Agency issues solid waste for California Integrated Waste Management Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter permitted active landfills in San Diego Co is sufficient existing permitted solid waste waste disposal needs.	ty Departments acility perments to Board (CIV) -44018) and er 4 (Section ounty with residuents.	quire solid waste facility permits to ent of Environmental Health, Local lits with concurrence from the VMB) under the authority of the d California Code of Regulations in 21440et seq.). There are five, emaining capacity. Therefore, there
g) Comply with federal, state, and loc waste?	cal statutes a	and regulations related to solid
Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated Discussion/Explanation:		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation.		

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range

CEQA Initial Study, TM 5257RPL ³ , Log No. 01-09-019	- 47 -	August 10, 2006
of a rare or endangered plant major periods of California his		ninate important examples of the y?
☐ Potentially Significant Impact☐ Potentially Significant UnlessMitigation Incorporated		Less than Significant Impact No Impact
Discussion/Explanation:		
Per the instructions for evaluating encotential to degrade the quality of the sish or wildlife species, cause a fish of evels, threaten to eliminate a plant of the range of a rare or endangered plant of the major periods of California history each question in sections IV and V of this evaluation considered the project Resources that have been evaluated project, particularly biology. However, these effects to a level below significances of non-native grasslands in the significance would result. Therefore, this Mandatory Finding of Significance.	e environment, sor wildlife popular animal commulant or animal or y or prehistory we feel this form. In acts potential for sel as significant wer, mitigation has ance. This mitige Ramona area. mitigation, significant, signific	substantially reduce the habitat of a tion to drop below self-sustaining unity, reduce the number or restrict eliminate important examples of vere considered in the response to addition to project specific impacts, ignificant cumulative effects. Yould be potentially impacted by the seen included that clearly reduces gation includes the purchase of 7.9 As a result of this evaluation, there ficant effects associated with this
a project are considerable who	considerable" m en viewed in cor	ually limited, but cumulatively eans that the incremental effects of nection with the effects of past and the effects of probable future
☐ Potentially Significant Impac		Less than Significant Impact
Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	S \square	No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PERMIT/MAP NUMBER	STATUS
TM 5311	pending
TPM 20656	approved
TPM 20703	pending
TPM 20415	approved

- 48 -

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to traffic, biology. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF and purchase of 7.9 acres of non-native grassland habitat within the Ramona area (a mitigation ratio of 1:1). As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		
Potentially Significant Impact Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	_	Less than Significant Impact No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following noise. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes: A) Grant to the County of San Diego a Noise Protection Easement over the entire area of Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Tentative Map 5257RPL³; B) Prior to the issuance of any building or grading permit for any residential use within the noise protection easement, the applicant shall:

1) Complete to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use, an acoustical analysis performed by a County certified acoustical engineer, demonstrating that the present and anticipated future noise levels for the interior and exterior of the residential dwelling will not exceed the allowable sound level limit of the Noise Element of the San Diego County General Plan [exterior (60 dB CNEL), interior (45 dB CNEL)] and the Ramona Community Plan. Future traffic noise level estimates for Hanson Lane must utilize a Level of Service "C" traffic flow for a Collector roadway and for Ashley Road must utilize a Level of Service "C" traffic flow for a two-lane Rural Collector. These are the designated General Plan Circulation Element buildout roadway classifications for these roads.

2) Incorporate to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use all of the recommendations or mitigation measures of the acoustical analysis into the project design and building plans.

As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

- CEQA/Preliminary Drainage Study dated January 3, 2006 prepared by P&D Consultants
- Stormwater Management Plan dated June 20, 2005 prepared by P&D Consultants
- Biological Resources Report dated November 1, 2005 prepared by Vincent Scheidt
- Acoustical Analysis Report dated December 27, 2005 prepared by Eilar Associates.
- Traffic Analysis dated March 24, 2005 prepared by Federhart and Associates.

AESTHETICS

- California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/)
- California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. ((www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

- County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).
- Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt)
- Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm)
- International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA.
 (http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm)
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.
- US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System.
 (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/nhsdatoc.html)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

- California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)
- County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

- CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.sandiego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.
- County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.
- Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

- Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.
- Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (http://www.wes.army.mil/)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook.
 Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (<u>www.leginfo.ca.gov</u>)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (<u>www.leginfo.ca.gov</u>)
- City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

- County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.
- Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.
- U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.
- California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)
- California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

- California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (<u>www.sdcounty.ca.gov</u>)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency
 Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code,
 Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq.
 (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 &13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov, http://www.amlegal.com/,)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220,
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

- 52 -

- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord. Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631.
- Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.
- Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

- National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.
- U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

- California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

- Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (http://www.access.gpo.gov/)
- Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html)
- International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
 Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise
 and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis
 and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C.,
 June 1995. (http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/)

POPULATION & HOUSING

- Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (http://www.census.gov/)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.
- California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFe e/attacha.pdf)
- County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permitsforms/manuals.html)
- Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permitsforms/manuals.html)

- Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.
- San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)
- US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

- California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)
- California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.
- US Census Bureau, Census 2000.
- US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.
- US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.
- US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

ND08-06\0109019-ISF;jcr